

Appl. No. 10/707,162
Amtd. Dated Sep. 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

REMARKS

By the above amendment, applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 6 and 9-14. Claims 7 and 8 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-6, 9-14 remain pending in the application.

Priority

Applicant submits herewith the required certified copy of the Taiwan Application No. 91134012.

Drawings

Applicant has amended FIG. 2 and added a new FIG. 5. Original FIGS. 5 and 6 have been renumbered as FIGS. 6 and 7. No new matter has been entered. Accordingly, three replacement drawing sheets and one new drawing sheet are attached hereto.

FIG. 2 includes the added feature whereby the "dot-web [is] located on a surface [of the light guide pipe] opposite to the light incident surface," as recited in original claim 8.

FIG. 5 shows the feature whereby "a density of the scattering balls becoming greater as [a] distance from the incident surface becomes greater,"

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 10/707,162
Amtd. Dated Sep. 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

as recited in claim 6.

Specification

In addition to correcting certain errors in the specification (see above), certain informalities in the claims have also been corrected and attended to (see above).

Claim objection

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informality: --is-- should be inserted after "dot-web" in line 2 of the claim.

Claim 8 has been canceled without prejudice, and the objection relating thereto is now moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 4, 7 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki (JP 10-197725 A).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Azuma (US 6,625,379 B1)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 10/707,162
Amtd. Dated Sep. 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

Claims 1-3, 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Graf et al. (US2004/0066645 A1)

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ohno et al. (US 6,825,243 B1)

In response to these rejections, applicant has added the subject matter of dependent claims 7 and 8 in independent claim 1. Amended claim 1 is the equivalent of claim 8 rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the original base claim 1 and intervening claim 7. Under "Allowable Subject Matter" on page 10 of the present Office action, it is stated that claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, amended independent claim 1 should be allowable.

Claim 2, 3, 4, 5, 9 and 10 depend directly from claim 1, and therefore should also be allowable.

Claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice, and the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

Further, applicant has added the subject matter of dependent claims 7

BEST AVAILABLE COPIE

Appl. No. 10/707,162
Amdt. Dated Sep. 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

and 8 into independent claim 11. Amended claim 11 has the essential, patentably distinguishing feature(s) of amended claim 1. Therefore, amended independent claim 11 should also be allowable.

Claim 12 depends from claim 11, and therefore should also be allowable.

Further, applicant has added the subject matter of dependent claims 7 and 8 into independent claim 13. Amended claim 13 has the essential, patentably distinguishing feature(s) of amended claim 1. Therefore, amended independent claim 13 should also be allowable.

Claim 14 depends from claim 13, and therefore should also be allowable.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohno et al (US 6,825,243 B2) in view of Kashima et al (US 5,521,797).

Applicant refers to and relies upon the above remarks regarding amended claim 1. That is, amended claim 1 is allowable over all of the references in this application, which includes Ohno in view of Kashima. Claim 6 depends directly from claim 1, and therefore should also be

Appl. No. 10/707,162
Amtd. Dated Sep. 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent claim upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As discussed above, claim 8 has been canceled, and the subject matter thereof has been incorporated into amended independent claims 1, 11 and 13. Therefore, amended independent claims 1, 11 and 13 should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, the present application as claimed in the pending claims is considered to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Leu et al

By



Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

Page 12 of 13

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 10/707,162
Arndt. Dated Sep. 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137